

By



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,653	02/19/2002	Ikuhito Onodera	111984	2584
25944	7590	07/14/2005		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER MAGEE, CHRISTOPHER R	
			ART UNIT 2653	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/076,653

Applicant(s)

ONODERA, IKUHIITO

Examiner

Christopher R. Magee

Art Unit

2653

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 April 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: In Figures 1 and 5, reference number 6 is not mentioned in the description. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement-drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

*(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Art Unit: 2653

2. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanuki (US 6,195,871 B1) in view of Kato et al. (hereinafter Kato) (US 6,747,846).

- Regarding claims 1 and 10, Watanuki discloses a wafer structure comprising:

thin film magnetic head assembly [12] [Figs. 1 and 2], which is fabricated on a given substrate [25],

an electrical circuit [14] including a circuit leading wire [32] so as to monitor the processing degree of said thin film magnetic head assembly, which is fabricated on said substrate,

a protective layer [36] so as to cover said thin film magnetic head assembly [12] and said electrical circuit [14],

a bump [41] so as to penetrate said protective layer and thus, to be exposed, which is fabricated on said substrate, and

an element leading wire [42] to be electrically connected to said thin film magnetic head element to be connected to an external circuit, which is fabricated on said substrate,

said element leading wire [42] being electrically connected with said circuit leading wire [32] [col. 4, lines 35-39],

said bump [41] is shared with said thin film magnetic head assembly and said electrical circuit [col. 4, lines 29-34].

Watanuki does not teach the element leading wire being in direct contact with the substrate.

Kato discloses an inside metal layer [116g] (i.e., element leading wire) that is electrically conductive contact with substrate [101g] [col. 9, lines 11-14; Fig. 7].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to furnish the wafer structure of Watanuki with the element leading wire in direct contact with the substrate as taught by Kato.

The rationale is as follows: One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to furnish the wafer structure of Watanuki with the element leading wire in direct contact with the substrate as taught by Kato in order to provide a higher equilibrium electrode potential in an aqueous solution than that of the magnetic thin film, thus retarding corrosion of the magnetic thin film during lapping procedures [Kato; col. 2, lines 51-67].

- Regarding claims 2 and 11, Watanuki shows a conductive film [52] to electrically connect said element-leading wire [42] and said circuit-leading wire [32].
- Regarding claims 3 and 12, Watanuki discloses the conductive film [52] is made by a sputtering method or a plating method [col. 4, lines 41-43].
- Regarding claims 4 and 13, Watanuki discloses the element-leading wire [42], said circuit-leading wire [32] and said conductive film [52] are made of the same conductive material [col. 4, lines 39-44].
- Regarding claims 5 and 14, Watanuki shows a bonding pad [20b] on the protective layer [36] so as to be electrically connected with said bump [Fig. 2].
- Regarding claims 6 and 15, Watanuki shows the bonding pad [22b] is elongated, on said protective layer, to the area of said electrical circuit [Fig 1].

Art Unit: 2653

- Regarding claims 7 and 16, Watanuki shows the bonding pad [20b] is narrowed (i.e., connection section 51) in the area between said thin film magnetic head assembly [12] and said electrical circuit [14].
- Regarding claims 8 and 17, Watanuki teaches the electrical circuit [14] is constructed of an electrical lap-guiding element [col. 1, lines 42-43].
- Regarding claims 9 and 18, Watanuki teaches the thin film magnetic head assembly [12] includes a reading head element, and the polishing degree of said reading head element is monitored by said electrical lap-guiding element [col. 2, lines 49-61].

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Conclusion*

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is annotated on PTO-892.
5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after


Art Unit: 2653

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R. Magee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7592. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8: 00 am-5: 30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Korzuch can be reached on (571) 272-7589. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Christopher R. Magee  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2653

July 10, 2005  
crm

  
GEORGE J. LETSCHER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER